## EX PARTE OR LATE FILED



## State of New Jersey

DIVISION OF THE RATEPAYER ADVOCATE
31 CLINTON STREET, 11TH FLOOR
P.O. BOX 46005
NEWARK NJ 07101

CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN

Governor

BLOSSOM A. PERETZ, Esq. Ratepayer Advocate and Director

June 3, 1998

ECFS AND OVERNIGHT
Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Room TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED

JUN - 4 1999

FCC MAIL ROOM

Re:

Petition of Global NAPs, Inc., For Preemption of the Jurisdiction of the New

Jersey Board of Public Utilities Pursuant to Section 252(e)(5) of the

Telecommunications Act of 1996

Docket No. 99-154

Dear Secretary Salas:

The New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate ("Ratepayer Advocate") has reviewed the comments submitted by various interested parties in connection to the petition filed in this matter by Global NAPs ("GNAPS") and submits the following response. The petition seeks to have the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") assume the jurisdiction from the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities ("Board") because of the Board's alleged failure to timely act in the matter of Petition of Global NAPs, Inc. For Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms, Conditions and related Arrangement as with Bell Atlantic- New Jersey, Inc. BPU Docket No. T098070426. The Ratepayer Advocate respectfully submits that as noted by the Board's counsel in its filed comments, prompt action by the Board to either accept or reject the proposed form of agreement, in view of the present state of the law would obviate the need for intervention by the FCC. No. of Copies rec'd List ABCDF

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("Act", or "1996 Act") was intended to open the local exchange and long distance markets to increased competition in order that consumers have more choices, reduced prices, expanded services, enhanced technology and innovation. To facilitate entry of competition in the local markets, Section 251 of the Act requires that an incumbent local exchange carrier ("ILEC"), such as Bell Atlantic-New Jersey ("BA-NJ"), provide to any requesting competitive local exchange carrier ("CLEC") interconnection and access to any of its services or network elements at rates, terms and conditions that are just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory. Furthermore, Section 252 of the Act established procedures for voluntary and direct negotiations, arbitration, and approval of interconnection agreements between ILECs and CLECs. Elements of an interconnection agreement which cannot be agreed upon within the time constraints referenced in the Act are submitted to arbitration. The final agreement, inclusive of those provisions resolved through Arbitration, must then be either accepted or rejected by the State Commission. <sup>1</sup>

Section 252 of the Act establishes a distinct process for the negotiation, arbitration, and approval of an interconnection agreement. First, voluntary negotiations take place during the first 135 days following the request to enter into an interconnection Agreement with the ILEC; second, the Act requires arbitration of the unresolved issues after the 160th day following the interconnection agreement request; then, the parties must incorporate the arbitrated terms with the negotiated terms followed by approval or rejection of the complete interconnection agreement by the State Commission. GTE South Inc. v. Morrison, et al., 957 F. Supp. 800,804 (E.D. Va. 1997).

In the herein controversy, GNAPS asserts that it is a CLEC entitled under the Act to choose,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Section 252(e)(1) of the Act provides that: "any interconnection Agreement shall be submitted for approval to the state commission...which . . . shall approve or reject the agreement with written findings as to any deficiencies"

as part of its interconnection agreement with BA-NJ, the same provisions as the pre-existing agreement between MFS and BA-NJ. BA-NJ claims that the GNAPS agreement should not have the same duration as the MFS agreement, and that reciprocal compensation is unwarranted because Internet calls, which GNAPS would carry, terminate beyond the local calling area. <sup>2</sup> The FCC's recent decision on this point is instructive. The Commission stated that:

[A]fter reviewing the record developed in response to these requests, we conclude that ISP-bound traffic is jurisdictionally mixed and appears to be largely interstate. This conclusion, however, does not in itself determine whether reciprocal compensation is due in any particular instance. [As explained below,]... parties may have agreed to reciprocal compensation for ISP-bound traffic, or a state commission, in the exercise of its authority to arbitrate interconnection disputes under section 252 of the Act, may have imposed reciprocal compensation obligations for this traffic. In the absence, to date, of a federal rule regarding the appropriate intercarrier compensation for this traffic, we therefore conclude that parties should be bound by their existing interconnection agreements,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>BA-NJ argues that the recent FCC ruling in <u>GTE Telephone</u>, <u>GTOC Transmittal No.</u> 1148, CC Docket No. 98-79, FCC 98-292, (October 30, 1998), that GTE's ADSL technology for internet connection to ISPs are jurisdictionally interstate applies here as well. However, The FCC specifically withheld from such a pronouncement and issued a separate order addressing reciprocal compensation issues. The FCC is mindful that several State Commissions have ruled that reciprocal compensation is due because dial-up service to the Internet is local in nature.

as interpreted by state commissions.3

The arbitrator in this matter determined that GNAPS is eligible to enter into an

interconnection agreement with BA-NJ, and that GNAPS can opt-into the MFS agreement as a

whole including its durational period (i.e., 19 days short of three years), with reciprocal

compensation, as set forth therein.

The Board's decision to accept or reject the arbitrator's decision in the underlying matter

does not require it to first reach a conclusion, as a matter of State regulatory policy, on issues such

as reciprocal compensation on Internet calls or durational periods in subsequent interconnection

agreements. The manner by which the Board chooses to address any such issues is distinctly within

the Board's discretion. Accordingly, as represented to the Commission by the Board's legal counsel

in its filed comments, since the Board has indicated its intention to expeditiously address the

underlying matter, it should be permitted the opportunity to do so and thus conclude the underlying

proceeding.

Very truly yours,

Blossom A. Peretz, Esq.,

DIVISION OF THE RATEPAYER ADVOCATE

JRB/pc

cc: Service List

Asst. Deputy Ratepayer Advocate

José Rivera-Benitez, Esq.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In FCC 99-38, the Commission made a February 26, 1999 Declaratory Ruling in CC Docket No 96-98 and notice of proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 99-68 relative to <u>I/M/O Implementation of the Local competition provision in the Telecommunication Act of 1996 FCC Docket No. 96-98, and <u>Inter-Carrier Compensation for ISP Board Traffic</u>, FCC Docket No. 96-68.</u>

## BLOSSOM A. PERETZ, DIRECTOR DIVISION OF THE RATEPAYER ADVOCATE

By: Jose Rivera-Benitez, Esq.
Assistant Deputy Ratepayer Advocate
Division of the Ratepayer Advocate
31 Clinton Street, 11th Floor
P.O. Box 46005
Newark, New Jersey 07101
(973) 648-2690

## Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of: : Petition of Global NAPs, Inc. for :

Preemption of Jurisdiction of the : CC Docket No. 99-154

New Jersey Board of Public Utilities : Pursuant to Section 252(e)(5) of the :

Communications Act : AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

Donna Carney, being of full age, deposes and says:

- 1. I am employed as a Legal Assistant in the Division of the Ratepayer Advocate. In that capacity I am assigned to work with Assistant Deputy Ratepayer Advocate Jose Rivera-Benitez.
- 2. On June 3, 1999, I caused a copy of the foregoing comments of the Ratepayer Advocate in the above-referenced matter to be sent via United Parcel Service (UPS) Next Day Air mail, postage prepaid, to the following:

Magalie Roman Salas Office of the Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, S.W. Room TW-A325 Washington, D.C. 20554 Janice M. Myles Common Carrier Bureau Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, S.W. Room 5-C327 Washington, D.C. 20554

Barry S. Abrams, Esq. Bell Atlantic-New Jersey 540 Broad Street Newark, NJ 07101

Christopher W. Savage, Esq. Karlyn D. Stanley, Esq. Cole Raywid & Braverman, L.L.P. 1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Suite 200 Washington, D.C. 20006-3458

William J. Rooney, Jr., Esq. General Counsel, Global NAPs Inc. Ten Merrymount Road Quincy, MA 02169

Mark C. Rosenblum, Esq. Roy E. Hoffinger, Esq. AT&T Corp. Room 3249J1 295 North Maple Avenue Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

David L. Lawson, Esq. James P. Young, Esq. Sidley & Austin 1722 Eye Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Gary Phillips, Esq. Larry A. Peck, Esq. Counsel for Ameritech 1401 H Street, N.W. Suite 1020 Washington, D.C. 20005 Theodore A. Livingston, Esq. Dennis G. Friedman, Esq. Mayer, Brown & Platt 190 South LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60603

R. Dale Dixon, Jr., Esq.
Lisa B. Smith, Esq.
Kecia Boney, Esq.
MCI Worldcom, Inc.
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Lawrence W. Katz, Esq. Bell Atlantic 1320 North Court House Road Eighth Floor Arlington, VA 22201

Mark W. Musser, Secretary Board of Public Utilities Two Gateway Center Newark, NJ 07102

Eugene P. Provost, DAG Division of Law 124 Halsey Street P.O. Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101

I also caused a copy of the comments to be sent via first class mail to:

International Transcription Service, Inc. (ITS) 1231 20th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Donna Carney

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 3rd day of June, 1999.

An/Attorney-at-Law of the State of New Jersey